

05/02/2008 15:24

3054458484

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

SANCHELIMA &amp; ASSOC.

PAGE 01/09

**MAY 02 2008**

Serial No. 10/822,079

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**In Re: Application of:  
Allen Berger, Jr.

Date: May 2, 2008

Serial No. 10/822,079

Art Unit: 3634

5 Filed: April 12, 2004

Examiner: Blair M. Johnson

Attorney Docket No. 240061.4

Title: GARAGE DOORS REINFORCEMENT SYSTEM


---

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AND  
AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL OFFICE REJECTION****CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

15 I HEREBY CERTIFY that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S.  
Patent & Trademark Office on May 2, 2008. I have been warned that willful  
false statements and the like are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both (18 U.S.C.  
1001), and may jeopardize the validity of this application, document, registration or  
patent resulting therefrom.

Adrian Rojas

(Typed or printed name of the person signing the certificate)



(Signature of the person signing the certificate)

FROM: SANCHELIMA & ASSOCIATES, P.A.  
235 S.W. Le Jeune Road, Miami, Florida 33134  
Tel.: 305-447-1617 Fax: 305-445-8484

TO: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Attn. Examiner: Blair M. Johnson / Art Unit: 3634  
Fax No. 571-273-8300

Papers included: Request for Reconsideration and Amendment, and Declaration of  
Allen Berger, Jr.

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**MAY 02 2008**

Serial No. 10/822,079

Commissioner for Patents  
**Mail Stop: NON-FEE AMENDMENT**  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

5 Sir:

In response to the recent Office action, please amend the above-referenced application as follows.

10

### INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

The Examiner has rejected the claims based on Section 112 because the "open reinforcing members" are recited with preamble making it unclear. Additionally, the Examiner has reiterated the rejection of the claims based on Section 102 and 103. Applicant has amended the preamble to obviate the Section 112 rejection and has submitted additional arguments clarifying his position and differences with the cited art.

20

25